ORIGINAL

NEW APPLICATION



1

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

## BEFORE THE ARIZE CORPERATION COMMISSION

2009 JAN 15 A 11: 32 **COMMISSIONERS** 

KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL **GARY PIERCE** PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY **BOB STUMP** 

In the matter of:

JEFFRIE HARPER (CRD #2863910)(a/k/a Jeff Harper) and KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER, husband and wife

DONALD ROBERT MATTSON JR (a/k/a Rob Mattson) and JANE DOE MATTSON. husband and wife

KNUCKLEBALL CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company

Respondents.

DOCKET NO. S-20649A-09-0013

NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING REGARDING **PROPOSED** ORDER **CEASE** DESIST. ORDER **AND FOR** RESTITUTION, FOR ADMINISTRATIVE **PENALTIES AND FOR OTHER** AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
Anzona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JAN 15 2009

DOCKETED BY

nR

**NOTICE:** EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING

EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER

The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") alleges that respondents JEFFRIE HARPER (a/k/a Jeff Harper), DONALD ROBERT MATTSON, JR (a/k/a Rob Mattson), and KNUCKLEBALL CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company, have engaged in acts, practices, and transactions that constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 et seq. ("Securities Act").

T.

#### **JURISDICTION**

The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the 1. Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

1
1

# 

## 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

# 

## 

## 

# 

## 

## 

#### 

II.

#### RESPONDENT

- 2. JEFFRIE HARPER (CRD #2863910)(a/k/a Jeff Harper) ("HARPER") is an individual who at all relevant times resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.
- 3. KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER was at all relevant times the spouse of HARPER. KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER is joined in this action under A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability of the marital community.
- 4. At all times relevant, HARPER was acting for his own benefit and the benefit or in furtherance of HARPER's and KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER's marital community.
- 5. DONALD ROBERT MATTSON, JR (a/k/a Rob Mattson) ("MATTSON") is an individual who at all relevant times resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.
- 6. JANE DOE MATTSON was at all relevant times the spouse of MATTSON. JANE DOE MATTSON is joined in this action under A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability of the marital community.
- 7. At all times relevant, MATTSON was acting for MATTSON's own benefit and the benefit or in furtherance of MATTSON's and JANE DOE MATTSON's marital community.
- 8. KNUCKLEBALL CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC ("KNUCKLEBALL") is an Arizona limited liability company organized on or about May 15, 2007. According to Commission records, HARPER and MATTSON are members of KNUCKLEBALL.
- 9. According to Commission records, KNUCKLEBALL's primary purpose is currency investing.
- 10. HARPER, MATTSON, and KNUCKLEBALL may be collectively referred to as "Respondents."
- 11. KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER and JANE DOE MATTSON may be collectively referred to as "Respondent Spouses."

III.

#### **FACTS**

- 12. Beginning in or around April 2007 until in or around February 2008, Respondents offered and sold securities in the form of investment contracts and/or commodity investment contracts ("Investment(s)"). Respondents sold at least \$179,000 of the Investments to at least 6 Arizona investors who at all relevant times resided in Arizona.
- 13. Respondents represented to the investors that the funds would be used to trade in the foreign currency exchange market. Respondents represented to at least one investor that the Respondents would be trading in the Euro/dollar market.
- 14. Respondents directed the investors to make their investment monies payable to KNUCKLEBALL. KUNCKLEBALL received the investor funds and pooled the funds in a bank account opened by MATTSON and controlled by MATTSON and HARPER.
- 15. The Respondents told investors different things as to who would conduct the trading. At least one investor was told MATTSON would conduct the trading. In another instance, HARPER told at least one investor that a "friend" would do the trading. Upon information and belief, the "friend" is MATTSON.
- 16. The Respondents promised positive returns to the investors solely from the efforts of the Respondents. At least one investor was promised returns of three (3) percent a month. However, none of the returns materialized.
- 17. The Respondents represented to the investors that their investor funds would be used for the Investments. None of the investors gave the Respondents authorization to use the investor funds for any purpose other than investing in the Investments.
- 18. The Respondents failed to tell investors they used the investor funds to repay other investors and withdraw the funds from the KNUCKLEBALL bank account in cash. In another instance, the Respondents failed to tell investors they transferred investor funds to an offshore bank account.

19. Respondents represented to investors different levels of risk regarding the Investments. In at least one instance, an investor was told that the Investment was risky but lucrative. In another instance, an investor was not told about any risks to the Investment, including but not limited to, the possibility that the investor may lose all or a large portion of the investment. In yet another instance, an investor was told that the Investment was a good, safe investment where the investor could not lose any money.

- 20. The Respondents failed to disclose any risks because a majority of investors who invested with the Respondents lost their entire investment.
- 21. KNUCKLEBALL and HARPER told at least one investor that the Investment was growing and doing well. This investor made a second Investment based on these statements. However, the Respondents failed to tell the investor that at the time of the investment the funds were being used for purposes other than the Investment.
- 22. Respondents failed to disclose that HARPER filed for bankruptcy and voluntary resigned from his position as a registered salesman, which misled investors to believe the Investments were risk-free and would generate positive returns, to wit:
- a. that on or about December 23, 2004, HARPER and KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER filed for protection under Chapter 7 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Arizona in the matter entitled *In re Harper*, case no. 2:04-bk-22104-GBN. On May 20, 2005, HARPER and KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER received a bankruptcy discharge.
- b. that HARPER was a registered salesman who resigned his position during an internal investigation for alleged misconduct. HARPER was a registered salesman with World Group Securities, Inc. ("WGS") from April 12, 2002 until August 27, 2004. WGS reported on the Central Registration Depository ("CRD") of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. ("FINRA") that HARPER "was permitted to resign while under internal review for failure to repay

debts owed to customer of the firm, possible sharing of commissions with a representative of another firm, and a possible unapproved outside business activity."

- 23. Some of the investors requested from HARPER statements of their accounts. HARPER did not provide any statements or accounting of the investment despite numerous requests, but assured at least one investor that the investment was doing well.
- 24. At least one investor contacted HARPER consistently to find out how the investment was doing. HARPER responded that the investment was fine and the monies were growing. However, MATTSON contacted this investor and told him that MATTSON lost \$50,000 in currency trading and that another \$50,000 was never received from the investor. HARPER later told this same investor that he used some of the funds to pay medical bills.
- 25. Another investor contacted HARPER regarding the status of the investment. HARPER told this investor that the money was gone and that MATTSON invested the funds in areas not intended for the funds.
- 26. At all times relevant, Respondents were not registered with the Commission as dealers or salesmen.
  - 27. At all times relevant, the Investments were not registered with the Commission.

#### IV.

## **VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841**

## (Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities)

- 28. From or around March 2007 until in or around November 2007, Respondents offered and sold securities in the form of investment contracts and/or commodity investment contracts within or from Arizona.
- 29. The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to Articles 6 or 7 of the Securities Act.
  - 30. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841.

# 

V.

## **VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842**

## (Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)

- 31. From or around March 2007 until in or around November 2007, the Respondents offered or sold securities in the form of an investment contract or commodity investment contracts within or from Arizona while not registered as dealers or salesmen pursuant to Article 9 of the Securities Act.
  - 32. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842.

#### VI.

## **VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991**

## (Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities)

- 33. In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona, the Respondents directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to make the statements made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were made; or (iii) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon offerees and investors. The conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- a) The Respondents provided information regarding potential positive returns to at least one investor, but failed disclose to at least one investor the risks associated with their investment including, but not limited to, the possibility that he/she may lose all or a large portion of their investment;
- b) Respondents failed to tell at least one investor that on or about December 23, 2004, HARPER and KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER filed for protection under Chapter 7 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Arizona in the matter entitled *In re Harper*, case no. 2:04-bk-22104-GBN. On May 20, 2005, HARPER and

KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER received a bankruptcy discharge. This failure misled investors to believe that the Investment was risk-free and would generate positive returns;

- c) Respondents failed to tell at least one investor that HARPER was a registered salesman who resigned his position during an internal investigation for alleged misconduct. HARPER was a registered salesman with World Group Securities, Inc. ("WGS") from April 12, 2002 until August 27, 2004. WGI reported on the Central Registration Depository ("CRD") of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. ("FINRA") that HARPER resigned for borrowing money from a WGI customer and did not pay it back, possibly referred business to another firm and shared commissions with a representative from that firm, and possibly participated in an unauthorized outside business activity. This failure misled investors to believe that the Investment was risk-free and would generate positive returns;
- d) The Respondents misrepresented to at least one investor that the investor would receive returns of three (3) percent per month when no returns materialized;
- e) The Respondents misrepresented to investors that the funds they invested would be used in their entirety for the Investments when the Respondents used investor funds to repay other investors, withdraw the funds as cash and/or transfer the funds to an offshore bank account;
- f) KNUCKLEBALL and HARPER misrepresented to at least one investor that the Investment was growing and doing well when the funds were used to repay other investors, withdraw the funds as cash and/or transfer the funds to an offshore bank account; and
- g) KNUCKLEBALL and HARPER misrepresented to at least one investor that the Investment was a good, safe investment where the investor could not lose any money when the funds were used to repay other investors, withdraw the funds as cash and/or transfer the funds to an offshore bank account.
  - 34. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1991.

#### VII.

## REQUESTED RELIEF

The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:

- 1. Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;
- 2. Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from Respondents' acts, practices, or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;
- 3. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036;
- 4. Order that the marital communities of JEFFRIE AND KATHLEEN JANICE HARPER and DONALD ROBERT (a/k/a Rob Mattson) and JANE DOE MATTSON be subject to any order of restitution, rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative action pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-215; and
  - 5. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

#### VIII.

## **HEARING OPPORTUNITY**

Each respondent including Respondent Spouses may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. **If a Respondent or a Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must also answer this Notice.** A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Linda Hogan, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602/542-3931, e-mail <a href="mailto:lhogan@azcc.gov">lhogan@azcc.gov</a>. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

#### IX.

## ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent or a Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

Additionally, the answering respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Aikaterine Vervilos.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering respondent or respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this <u>/</u>5 day of January, 2009.

Matthew J. Neubert Director of Securities

(AV)